

BLUE GRASS BLADE

WE AIM TO CUT DOWN ERROR AND ESTABLISH TRUTH.

A. T. Parker
High and Ashland East Side
Volume XVI.—Number 11.

LEXINGTON, KY., JULY 14, 1907.

Published Weekly.—\$1.50 per Year, in advance.

RULE

BY DIVINE RIGHT

Is Not Yet Abolished Altogether and We Must Yet Fight to Retain a Free Press

AMERICAN LIBERTY
RAPIDLY VANISHING

(By Theodore Schroeder.)

For over a century it has been believed that we had abolished rule by divine right, and the accompanying infallibility of officialism, and that we have maintained inviolate the liberty of conscience, of speech and of press. However, this belief of ours is fast becoming a matter of illusion. Though a love for such liberty is still verbally avowed, yet in every conflict raising an issue over it it is denied in practice. There is not a State in the Union to-day in which the liberty of the press is not abridged upon several legitimate subjects of debate. Here will be discussed but one of these, and that perhaps the most unpopular.

By gradual encroachments and unconscious piling of precedent upon precedent, we are rapidly approaching the stage in which we will enjoy any liberties only by permission, not as a matter of right. In this progressive denial of the freedom of conscience, speech and press, all three branches without seriously disturbing the serene, sweet, century-long slumber into which we were lulled by the songs of liberty, whose echoes still resound in our ears, but whose meaning we have long since forgotten.

A century ago we thought that we had settled all these problems of liberty. In all our constitutions we placed a verbal guarantee of liberty of speech and press, and then stupidly went to sleep, assuming that the adequate potency for self-enforcement. This is the usual mistake, always so fatal to all liberties, and the multitude is too superficial and too much engrossed with a law order of selfish pursuits to discover that constitutions need the support of a public opinion which demands that every doubtful construction shall be resolved against the state and in favor of individual liberty.

In the absence of such construction constitutions soon become the chains which enslave, rather than the safeguards of liberty. Thus it has come that under the guise of "judicial construction," all constitutions have been judicially amended, until those who, by a dependence upon the Constitution, endeavor to defend themselves in the exercise of a proper liberty. Persons finding satisfaction or profit in repudiating constitutional guarantees, and combining therewith sufficient political power to ignore them with impunity, unconsciously develop in themselves a contempt for the fundamental equalities which most founders of republics sought to maintain. This contempt is soon shared by those who find themselves the helpless victims of misplaced confidence in constitutions, and through them is transused to the general public, until that which we should consider the sacred guarantee of our liberties becomes a joke, and those who rely upon it are looked upon as near to imbecility.

Some years ago a United States Senator (Mr. Cullom) was reported as saying that "in the United States there is no constitution but public opinion." We should also remember the unconscious humor which made Congressman Timothy Campbell famous. He was urging President Cleveland to sign a bill which had passed Congress and the latter objected because he believed the bill to be violative of the organic law. Our ingenious statesman broke in with the earnest plea: "What's the Constitution as between friends?" General Trumbull once said: "The Constitution has hardly any existence in this country except as rhetoric.... By virtue of its sublime promise to establish justice, we have seen injustice done for nearly a hundred years. It answers very well for Fourth-of-July purposes, but as a charter of liberty it has very little force." In Idaho, at the time of the official kidnapping of Moyer and others in Colorado, the attorney of these men tried to show the court the unconstitutionality of the procedure, when the baffled rage of the judge prompted him to

exclaim: "I am tired of these appeals to the Constitution. The Federal Constitution is a defective, out-of-date instrument, anyhow, and it is useless to fetch that document into court. But Constitution or no Constitution, we have got the men we went after; they are here; they are going to stay here until we have had our final say, and I would like to know what is going to be done about it?" No wonder that the wise Herbert Spencer wrote: "Paper constitutions raise smiles on the faces of those who have observed their results."

All this is true because the great mass are indifferent to the constitutionally-guaranteed liberties of others, and so allowed sordid self-interest and bigotry to add one limitation after another, until all freedom will be destroyed by judicial amendments to our character of liberty.

That the State is a separate entity is a mere fiction of the law, which is useless within the very narrow limit of the necessities which called it into existence. This is judiciously recognized by our courts and by thoughtful laymen. By getting behind the fiction to view the naked fact, we discover that the State has no existence except as a few fallible office holders theoretically representing the public sentiment, expressing its power, sometimes doing good and often thriving on the ignorance and indifference of the masses. When we abolished the infallibility of rulers by divine right, we at the same time abolished the political duty of believing either in God or what was therefore supposed to be His political creation, the State.

Henceforth government was to be viewed only as a human expedient, to accomplish purely human ends, and subject to be transformed or abolished at the will and discretion of those by those will and discretion it was created and is maintained. The exclusively secular ends of government were to protect each equally in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. So the fathers of our country in their Declaration of Independence wrote that: "Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it." Similar Declarations were made by the separate colonies. Thus the Pennsylvania Declaration of Rights contains these words: "The community hath an indubitable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to reform, alter or abolish, government, in such manner as shall be by that community judged most conducive to the public weal." In harmony with these declarations we made laws, such that political offenders, though they had been in open revolt to a tyrannous foreign government, or had slain the minions of the tyrant, they might here find a safe retreat from extradition.

All this has passed away. Formerly it was our truthful boast that we were the freest people on earth. To-day it is our silent shame that among all the tyrannical governments on the face of the earth ours is probably the only one which makes the right of admission depend upon the abstract political opinions of the applicant. Our people denounce the unspeakable tyranny of a bloody Czar, and the pass laws here to protect him in the exercise of his brutalities in Russia. Instead of being "the land of the free and the home of the brave" we exclude from our shores those who are brave and seek freedom here, and punish men for expressing unpopular opinions if they already live here. In vain do the afflicted ones appeal to a "liberty loving" populace for help in maintaining liberty.

Under our immigration laws no anarchist, that is "no person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized governments" is allowed to enter the United States, even though such person be a non-resistant Quaker. In other words, the person who believes with the signers of the Declaration of Independence that those who create and maintain governments have a right to abolish them, and who also desire to persuade the majority of the fellow-men to exercise this privilege, are denied the admission to our national domain.

Of course that and kindred legislation was the out-growth of the most crass ignorant and hysteria over the word "anarchist." I say most crass ignorance deliberately, because to me it is unthinkable that any sane man with an intelligent conception of what is believed by such non-resistant an-

(Continued on fourth page.)

MARBLE

BUST OF PAINE

as at Last Granted a Place in Independence Hall by an Overwhelming Vote in Honor to Him.

JUSTICE COMES AT LAST WHERE IT IS DUE.

(By Jas. B. Elliott.)

Honor be to those to whom honor is due. Time is not ungrateful and the ages will, as a rule, recognize true merit and virtue.

Proof of such a declaration is offered by an article from the pen of James B. Elliott, of Philadelphia, secretary of the Paine Memorial Society, published in the July issue of Tomorrow which explains how a marble bust of Thomas Paine, once refused, was at last given place in Independence Hall. It reads:

The marble bust of Thomas Paine by Sydney Morse, now in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, was first presented to the city council Nov. 26, 1876. It was accepted by the Common Council by a vote of 40 to 2, one of the latter being a saloon-keeper. In the select council the motion to accept was lost owing to the violent speech made against the character of Paine by Charles Thompson Jones, who has since passed to the undiscovered country and public sentiment has changed, and the bust was accepted Sept. 11, 1905.

The story of the twenty-nine years' contest with pious bigotry and the final triumph by the persistence and perseverance of a few faithful members of the Paine Memorial Association is here briefly told.

"The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft' interred with their bones."

Col. Damon V. Kilgore and Thomas Phillips, president of the Paine Memorial Association, presented the bust in behalf of the subscribers, and Charles Thompson Jones made the following speech, objecting to its reception:

I feel great diffidence in speaking on this question from the fear that I may not do justice to the subject, but I hope I may be able to show the character of Thomas Paine to have been so treacherous to General Washington that not a member of the select council will vote in favor of the resolution. I pride myself upon my ancestry. My aversion to this man, or I may say my prejudice, was formed in boyhood days and from what I heard from the last survivors of the American revolution in the neighborhood in which I lived—those who fought from pure love of country.

Mr. President, you are aware that the leading men of the revolution were divided in opinion as to the merits of the political writings of Tom Paine. Some contended that he did more harm than good to the cause and the pious, God-fearing portion of the community believed that this violent, vindictive man tried to retard the civil and religious rights that they were contending for, therefore religious people who hold in contempt him whom you propose to honor on this centennial year.

The French minister spoke of Paine in the most contemptible terms. Mr. Paine received great credit for articles he wrote against England during the struggle with that country; but it was of very little consequence to him on which side he wrote—that was his profession. It is not generally known that he was paid out of a secret fund, in addition to his salary as clerk of the Pennsylvania assembly, for which he received \$800 per year in continental money. He would not accept Washington's word, but demanded Robert Morris as security for his fees.

He went to France, after being found in intrigues against this nation, and was placed in prison and pretended to believe that General Washington was the cause of his imprisonment—the man who had been his benefactor. He had the audacity to say to him: "You have not served America with more disinterestedness or greater zeal nor more fidelity than myself, and I know, not with better effect." He spoke of General Washington as Mr. Washington. He claimed to have sailed with Colonel John Laurens from Boston Feb. 1, 1781, for France, in the ship Alliance, and with the aid of

Benjamin Franklin obtained a present from the king of \$6,000,000 as a loan and that a fleet of thirty sails would be sent to aid America. "Colonel Laurens and myself returned from Brest the first of June following with 200,000 pounds sterling and we arrived at Boston Aug. 25."

De Grasse arrived with the French fleet and was afterward joined by Barras, making thirty-one sail in line. The money was transported in wagons from Boston to the bank of Philadelphia. It was by the aid of money and of this fleet and of Rochambeau's army that Cornwallis was taken, the laurels of which have been given to General Washington.

All of these statements can be verified by consulting the records of the historical society.

I think that I have shown the character of this man who has assailed the "Father of His Country," but a graver charge I have yet to make. He also wrote a bitter pamphlet against the Christian religion and the Holy Bible, in which he states: "The fable of Jesus Christ as told in the New Testament—the story taking it as a whole, as it is told, is blasphemously obscene." He speaks of the mother of our Lord as being debauched by a ghost, and further states that the Christian faith is built upon heathen mythology. Do you think, gentlemen of councils, that the marble bust of Tom Paine should be placed in the Hall of Independence with Washington, Franklin, Jefferson and Robert Morris? I hope you will vote against it.

John Bickley of the Sixth ward said, "I don't see much difference. One man abuses the Father of his country; the other man upholds General Grant, whose administration, I think, was one of the most corrupt we have had since General Washington. They are both infidels of the same stripe. I don't know if they are both Republicans. I know one of them made a speech at the Union League. I should like to amend the resolution by having a bust of Robert Morris and an independence Hall. The motion was laid over. Mr. Shoemaker was sick and unable to be present to reply to the charges made by Charles Thompson Jones, but he died and the members of the Select Council voted against its reception.

The marble bust cost \$1,200, the money being raised by subscription through the Boston Index and but few of the original subscribers remain to rejoice in the victory. Many are dead—many indifferent, but the kind Providence that saved the life of Thomas Paine on three occasions and permitted him to die a peaceful death at the age of three scores and ten, has also permitted Thomas Phillips to be present at the acceptance by Independence Hall of the bust of Paine, which he with Damon Kilgore presented on the 100th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, of which Thomas Paine was the real promoter. I am also grateful that I am permitted to tell the history of the struggle, and hope to be present in the city of New York with Brother Phillips at the home of Thomas Paine in Bleeker St. and attend the centenary of the death of Paine. I extend an invitation to all to visit the Hall and Museum, and there view the original edition of Common Sense, published in 1776, presented by this association in 1902, and will be pleased to enroll your name and give any information about the association.

CHRIST, CANNON AND CRANKS

Nations Depend Upon Their Guns in Times of War Instead of the Prayers of Chaplains.

THEN WHY NOT FIRE THE WHOLE CABOODLE

(The National Rip-Saw.)

Among the fearless of the numerous exchanges that reaches the Blade is The National Rip-Saw, published at St. Louis, Mo. Its motto is to be "Blind as a bat to everything but right" and judging from its columns the editorial policy is in keeping with that sentiment. Recently it published the following bold article which is worthy of wide reading:

How bully every inhabitant of the United States should feel at our great president receiving the peace prize of forty thousand dollars from the Norwegian Parliament.—Yes, every son-

of-a-gun's chest in the entire Uncle Samuel should heave out with manly exultations.

This country is coming to the front fast, as we are getting to be the greatest people on earth in many things, and especially in "tommy-rot," as we permit one per cent of the inhabitants to own the wealth, while ninety-nine per cent work like "niggers" to produce it; but that don't make any difference, as the doctors say that work is good for the health of the average woolen hat; but every horny handed son-of-a-tail should spend at least one day out of every week in rejoicing over that Nobel peace prize that "Teddy" swiped, as that is the greatest and most laughable thing that ever happened within the borders of this great domain.

A few short months ago in one of Mr. Roosevelt's messages, he used the following language:

"If the great civilized nations of the present day should completely disarm, the result would mean an immediate recrudescence of barbarism in one form or another."

But upon the heels of this heathenish and barbarous declaration, he raked in the Nobel peace prize.—Why it is enough to make an ossified Chinaman grin.

This country has never had, since it became a nation, a president that has talked as much about Christ and the bible as "Teddy the Immaculate," but he has always managed to sandwich cannon in long with this Christ preaching, and if we will take an inventory of the money that has been spent, we will find that the cannon end of Mr. Roosevelt's administration has received dollars where the Christ end didn't receive pennies, and the thing which a man spends his money for is undoubtedly the thing that nestles up nearest to his gizzard.

We, at the present time, are controlled by a set of leaders, who in one breath proclaim the teachings of Christ, but who rely more upon the efficacy of the cannon than upon the doctrines of the Lord. Nazarene, which undoubtedly brands our leaders as either a troop of forthright cranks or else those they control set of the needs of the day. Vd., ot by their Christ and Cannon doctrine, as an unaltered set of the same breed.

Think of it, Mr. Reader, the highest official in a land such as ours, that boasts of being the most enlightened and the most civilized nation upon the face of the earth, declaring that if all civilized nations were to sink their war vessels to the bottom of the ocean and spike their cannon and destroy their musketry, and explode their gun-cotton, and do away with would at once revert back to barbarism. Who, Mr. Reader, are you going to give thanks to for the civilization of the present day, Christ or Cannon?—If Mr. Roosevelt is right, then let us turn up every bible that we can find, and use our number ten brogans upon the seat of the pants of our preachers and priests, and confiscate the churches and theological seminaries and turn them into military institutions, and teach our boys and girls how to shoot glory and civilization into the hides of their neighbors.

Now, my "dearly beloved," never in the history of this, or any other country has anyone ever aimed such a body blow at the doctrines of Jesus Christ as has Theodore Roosevelt by his barbarous declaration that regardless of all our schools, of all our churches, and of all our colleges that we would at once sink back into barbarism without a mighty standing army. If Theodore Roosevelt is right in this declaration, then away with everything but militarism, and let us do as he suggests in his last message, and establish "rifle clubs in our public schools," and instead of teaching little "Johnny" the Ten Commandments, let's teach him how to hit the bull's eye at a thousand yards, and ring the bell of a target nine times out of ten, so that he will be able to shoot civilization into his neighbor, who relies upon the doctrines of Jesus Christ to keep him in the highway of holiness. Let us forever cease condemning the Emperor of Germany for compelling each of his male subjects to serve a certain number of years in his army, and let us forever pay homage to European countries who sap the vitality of their inhabitants in order to feed and clothe a standing army of hundreds of thousands; for if turning the sword into a plowshare

(Continued on Page 4.)

MAN

AS IN THE BODY

Is the Only Man the World Can Possibly Know and this Dispenses with the Soul Idea.

DEMAND FOR DOES NOT MAKE IMMORTALITY

(By J. T. Lloyd.)

It is something unusual for a Harvard Professor to get a roast in criticism at the hands of an English Free-thinker, and as such has come to us through the Free-thinker the following will be read with interest:—

Immortality is a subject which philosophers and theologians are ever fond of discussing, and concerning which they have never been able to see eye to eye. In the cune number of the Hibbert Journal, the erudite idealist, Professor Josiah Royce, of Harvard University, tries his metaphysical hand at the vexed problem. He gives us his views on man, time, eternity and God; and these views the such that, in his opinion, immortality is an unavoidable inference from them. Man is immortal because he wants to be, and he wants to be because God is as yet dissatisfied with the expression of himself, and will not let him alone until he arrives at perfection. This is a very old argument, but it sounds new as stated by the Professor. He says:—

"In me, God is discontented with his own temporal expression. This very discontent I myself am. It constitutes me. This individual thirst for infinity, this personal warfare with my own temporal maladjustment to my own ideal—this is my personality. —In me the temporal being, in me now, God is in need, is hungry, is thirsty, is in prison. In me, then, God is dissatisfied. But he is not dissatisfied with the absolute. Eternity must be satisfied. As an eternal personality, I have an insatiable need for an opportunity to find, to define, and to accomplish my individual and unique ruty. This need of mine is God's need in me and of me. Seen, then, from the eternal point of view, my personal life must be an endless series of deeds."

Such, in brief, is Professor Royce's argument for immortality. It is ingenious, it is subtle, and it is cleverly worked out; but to what does it really amount? What is the practical import of it? It is purely metaphysical argument, and of no evidential value whatever. It may be logically flawless and philosophically sound; but it is built on a foundation of sand. Let us examine it.

Everything in Professor Royce's argument rests on his definition of time. To him, man has reality only as a being "of will and of meaning, of ideals and of personal character, whose value you acknowledge. This real man is—what he is worth. This definition of man naturally leads up to that of time. "Time, to mind," he says, "is an essential practical aspect of reality, which derives its whole meaning from the nature and from the life of the will." Of course, this idealistic definition of time involves the following conclusion:—

"Take away from your conception of the world the idea of a being who has a will, who has a practical relation to facts; take away the idea of a being who looks before and after, who strives, seeks, hopes, pursues, records, reports, promises accomplishes; take away, I say, every idea of such a being from your world, and whatever then remains in your conceived world, gives you no right to a conception of time as any real aspect of things."

Professor Royce waxes exceedingly merry over what he terms "the time physics" saying that it "is indeed but of the timepieces and of mechanics, science, the time of geology and or an abstraction." "It has no ultimate meaning," he adds, "except in relation to beings that have a will, that live a practical life, and that mean to do something." "Apart from their needs, time is nothing." Now, in addition to the individual will, there is what the Professor calls "a world-will." If you look beneath the abstractions," he says, "you find that time is in essence the form of the infinite will, and that when I acknowledge one universal world-time, I do

Continued on fourth page.